



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/775,994

02/02/2001

Kevin Eugene Dombkowski

LUC-300/Dombkowski

7453

47382

7590

10/04/2006

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
ONE NORTH LASALLE STREET  
44TH FLOOR  
CHICAGO, IL 60602

7-4

EXAMINER

MANNING, JOHN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/775,994

Applicant(s)

DOMBKOWSKI ET AL.

Examiner

John Manning

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 and 38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

1. The indicated allowability (if rewritten into independent form) of claim 37 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Grossman et al. (US Pat No 5,835,730). The examiner apologizes for any inconvenience. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 9, 12-13, 20-21, 27-28, 35 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gummalla (US 200210021711) in view of Grossman et al. (US Pat No 5,835,730).

Regarding claim 1, Gummalla discloses a method of sending PCM data (page 2, paragraph 40) upstream and downstream via a cable protocol (using a CMTS as defined in paragraph 18), teaching the data sent without packet headers (pages 3-4, paragraph 54). In addition, Gummalla discloses "when G.711 PCM voice generates a byte of data every 125 microseconds" on page 2, paragraph 40. Since it is stated that

Art Unit: 2623

the data is generated every 125 microseconds, the signals are constructed at a regular sampling interval. Gummalla fails to disclose enclosing the signal without application-level packet headers in a Motion Pictures Experts Group (MPEG) transport. In analogous art, Grossman discloses enclosing the signal without application-level packet headers in a Motion Pictures Experts Group (MPEG) transport (column 1, line 53 – column 2, line 44; column 4, lines 14-51). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit more than one signal in a single mini-slot as shown by Grossman through the transmission system as taught by Gummalla. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the provide a low cost cable modem for internet access. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for cable providers to employ enclosing the signal without application-level packet headers in a Motion Pictures Experts Group (MPEG) transport for the stated advantage.

Regarding claim 9, Gummalla teaches a cable system having a cable modem (depicted as 104 in Figure 1 and described in page 2, paragraph 38), which meets the [imitation of the media terminal adapter. In the adaptation of the invention in which the data is sent without packet headers as mentioned above, it is inherent that the associated media terminal adapter would have decreased functionality. By virtue of transmitting the data without headers, certain hardware functionality would not be required. 5.

Regarding claims 12, 20, 27 and 35, Gummalla discloses a voice signal but fails to disclose a video signal. Official Notice is taken it would have been well known to

communicate upstream video signals with voice signals to enable video telephone capabilities or video conference capabilities. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gummalla to include the claimed video signal for the benefit of enabling video telephone capabilities or video conference capabilities.

Regarding claim 13, Gummalla discloses all of the limitations as mentioned in regards to claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 21, Gummalla discloses all of the limitations as mentioned in regards to claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 28, Gummalla discloses an upstream transport device (cable modem 104 of page 2, paragraph 38) which transports PCM data without packet headers as described previously for claim 1. The presence of an upstream data channel is evident by the statement "data flows 'upstream' from the cable modem to the CMTS" in page 1, paragraph 18. Also, Gummalla teaches, "when G.711 PCM voice generates a byte of data every 125 microseconds" on page 2, paragraph 40. In order for this to occur, there must be a sampler present that yields PCM data.

Regarding claim 36, all limitations are met by Gummalla as disclosed for claim 28 above, wherein he implies of a media terminal adapter with reduced subscriber functionality as discussed previously for claim 9.

Regarding claim 38, Gummalla fails to disclose the claimed wherein the step of sending one or more upstream signals comprises sending the one or more upstream signals as pulse code modulated data in a form that allows transfer to PSTN without

transcoding the PCM data of one or more upstream signals. Official Notice is taken it would have been well known to transfer PCM signals to PSTN without transcoding for the benefit of transferring signals over a widely accessible, well established and well connected network without the need for transcoding.

4. Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 14-16, 22, 23, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gummalla in view of Grossman et al. and further in view of DOCSIS Specifications.

Regarding claim 2, Gummalla discloses all limitations discussed for claim 1 above. In addition, Gummalla teaches that the PCM data samples are taken at a sampling interval, disclosed in paragraph 40. Gummalla does not, however, disclose mapping the PCM samples to an allocation of mini-slots in the upstream protocol, nor does he disclose that the upstream and downstream protocols are DOCSIS protocol. In analogous art, the DOCSIS standards disclose the use of DOCSIS protocol to transmit both upstream and downstream communications. Equipment assumptions (specifically section 2.2.1 of page 7, along with tables 2-1 and 2-2 of pages 8 and 9) of the DOCSIS protocol teach hardware for data transmission in both the upstream and downstream directions. Also disclosed in the DOCSIS standards is transmitting data through an allocation of mini-slots in the upstream direction. This is also part of standard DOCSIS protocol. Section 6.5.4 on pages 93- 94 of the DOCSIS standards discloses using mini-slots, stating that 'a "mini-slot" is the unit of granularity for upstream transmission

opportunities.' At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to map the PCM samples present in the system of Gummalla to an allocation of mini-slots as taught by DOCSIS standards. The suggestion for using the DOCSIS protocol to transmit the data of Gummalla instead of other available protocols would be that, as stated on page 1 of the DOCSIS standards, the DOCSIS protocol was a jointly created standard protocol that was designed to "permit the early definition, design, development, and deployment of data-over- cable systems on an uniform, consistent, open, non-proprietary, multi-vendor interoperable basis" (see section 1.3.1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to carry out the transmission system of Gummalla according to the DOCSIS protocol because the system would then be operable with all cable operators who have embraced the standard, including most of the largest providers in the world.

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Gummalla and the DOCSIS standards teach all limitations of the claim as discussed above, wherein the use of mini-slots to map samples is part of the assumed DOCSIS protocol standards.

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Gummalla and the DOCSIS standards teach all of the limitations as stated above for claim 3, wherein Gummalla discloses sampling PCM data every 125 microseconds (page 2, paragraph 40) and the DOCSIS standards teach mini-slots occurring every 6.25 microseconds. Page 21 of the DOCSIS standards, section 4.2.1 teaches that the timing boundaries (edges of the mini-slots) for upstream communications are "spaced at integer multiples of 6.25 microseconds apart." If the integer would be one, then the mini- slot separation would be 6.25 microseconds.

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Gummalla and the DOCSIS standards teach all limitations of the claim as discussed above, wherein the DOCSIS standards teach the use of DOCSIS as a downstream protocol.

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Gummalla and the DOCSIS standards teach all limitations of the claim as discussed above, wherein pages 43-44 of the DOCSIS standards teaches that downstream transmission is a stream of MPEG information (second paragraph of section 5.1). This information is transmitted through the MPEG transport layer, as evident when the DOCSIS standards define the headers as "MPEG Transport Stream" headers in section 5.3. Thus, the data transmitted downstream in MPEG format is sent through the MPEG transport stream of the channel.

Regarding claim 14, the combination of Gummalla and the DOCSIS standards teach all limitations of the claim as discussed above, wherein the DOCSIS standards disclose the ability of the system to transmit data upstream via DOCSIS protocol.

Regarding claim 15, the combination of Gummalla and the DOCSIS standards teach all limitations of the claim as discussed above, wherein the use of mini-slots to map samples is part of the assumed DOCSIS protocol standards as discussed previously in the rejection of claim 2.

Regarding claim 16, the combination of Gummalla and the DOCSIS standards teach all limitations of the claim as discussed for claim 13 above, wherein Gummalla discloses sampling data at 125 microsecond intervals and DOCSIS standards teach mini-slots of 6.25 microseconds. See explanation for claim 4 above.



Regarding claim 22, the combination of Gummalla and the DOCSIS standards teach all limitations of the claim as discussed for claim 21 above, wherein the DOCSIS standards disclose the ability of the system to transmit data downstream via DOCSIS protocol.

Regarding claim 23, the combination of Gummalla and the DOCSIS standards teach all limitations of the claim as discussed for claim 21 above, wherein the DOCSIS standards teach that the data transmitted downstream is transmitted through the MPEG transport stream as discussed for claim 7 above.

Regarding claim 29, the combination of Gummalla and the DOCSIS standards teach all limitations of the claim as discussed for claim 28 above, wherein the DOCSIS standards disclose the ability of the system to transmit data upstream via DOCSIS protocol.

Regarding claim 30, the combination of Gummalla and the DOCSIS standards teach all limitations of the claim as discussed for claim 28 above, wherein the use of mini-slots to map samples is part of the assumed DOCSIS protocol standards as discussed previously in the rejection of claim 2.

Regarding claim 31, the combination of Gummalla and the DOCSIS standards teach all of the limitations as stated above for claim 30, wherein Gummalla discloses sampling PCM data every 125 microseconds (page 2, paragraph 40) and the DOCSIS standards teach mini-slots occurring every 6.25 microseconds. See detailed explanation as discussed for claim 4. Page 6

5. Claims 5, 17, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gummalla in view of Grossman et al. and further in view of Campbell (US 5,390,181).

Regarding claim 5, Gummalla discloses all of the limitations as set forth for claim 1 above; however, he fails to disclose sending two or more signals in one mini-slot. In analogous art, Campbell discloses a transmission channel control method wherein two or more request signals can be transmitted in a single mini-slot (column 8, lines 53-54). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit more than one signal in a single mini-slot as shown by Campbell through the transmission system as taught by Gummalla. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users attempting to send more than one signal from a single location at a single instant to do so. Allowing two signals to be transmitted simultaneously not only helps prevent latency, but also maximizes bandwidth by using a minimum of transmission slots. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for cable providers to employ a multiplexing scheme to transmit multiple signals in a single mini-slot via the system of Gummalla to provide better service to clients.

Regarding claim 17, the combination of Gummalla and Campbell disclose all limitations stated for claim 13 above, wherein Campbell teaches combining two or more signals into a single mini-slots as discussed in the above explanation for claim 5.

Regarding claim 32, the combination of Gummalla and Campbell disclose all limitations stated for claim 28 above, wherein Campbell teaches combining two or more signals into a single mini-slots as discussed in the above explanation for claim 5.

6. Claims 8 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gummalla in view of Grossman et al. and further in view of Gordon (US 6,614,843).

7. Regarding claim 8, Gummalla discloses all of the limitations as set forth for claim 1 above; however, he fails to disclose multiplexing two or more signals into a single MPEG packet identifier. In analogous art, Gordon teaches a program guide transmission system in which one or more audio and one or more video signals are multiplexed together to create a single transmission stream, wherein the multiplexed signals share a common packet identifier. (See column 44, lines 19-27). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to multiplex the multiple signals as taught by Gummalla within a single packet identifier as taught by Gordon. The motivation for doing so would have been to group data streams (audio, video, etc) depicting the same event together so that when they would reach the output end of the transmission channel the system would be able to demultiplex them together as well. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to multiplex multiple signals transmitted downstream to the user via a cable protocol into a single packet identifier for easy information retrieval.

Regarding claim 24, the combination of Gummalla and Gordon teaches all of the stated limitations of the claim as described for claim 21 above, wherein Gordon teaches multiplexing multiple signals into a single packet identifier as discussed previously for claim 8. Page 8

8. Claims 10-11, 18-19, 25-26, and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gummalla in view of Grossman et al. and further in view of Sala (US 2001/0053152).

Regarding claim 10, Gummalla teaches all limitations discussed for claim 1 above. Gummalla fails to disclose that transmitting the information without headers would reduce delay and jitter of the signals. In analogous art, Sala discloses that adding packet overhead would require more bandwidth and may cause packet latency (page 2, paragraph 19). Sa[a also teaches that this is a problem (page 2, paragraph 20). Since Sala acknowledges that adding packet overhead would require more bandwidth and may cause latency, it is apparent that in the absence of additional packet overhead problems such as delay and jitter (latency) would be diminished. 36. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the header-less transmission system of Gummalla to reduce delay and jitter. The suggestion for doing so would be that Sala discloses it is well known in the art that the latency caused by excessive packet headers is a problem that needs solved. Since the problem had been recognized and a solution was identified prior to the time of invention,

Art Unit: 2623

it would have been obvious to create the headerless transmission system for the purpose of reducing delay and jitter for a cleaner, crisper signal on the output of the system.

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Gummalla and Sala teaches art of the aforementioned limitations, wherein Sala discloses that at least one of the downstream signals is a video signal (page 3, paragraph 43). Sara states, "the data exchanged between CMTS and cable modems includes text, video, audio, voice, graphics, other media, or a combination thereof."

Regarding claim 18, the combination of Gummalla and Sara teaches all of the limitations as discussed for claim 13, wherein Sara teaches that reducing the amount of header information associated with the transmitted signal can reduce latency and save bandwidth. See rejection of claim 10 for further explanation.

Regarding claim 19, the combination of Gummalla and Sara teaches all of the limitations as discussed for claim 13 above, wherein Sara discloses that at least one of the downstream signals is a video signal (page 3, paragraph 43).

Regarding claim 25, the combination of Gummalla and Sara teaches all of the limitations as discussed for claim 21, wherein Sara teaches that reducing the amount of header information associated with the transmitted signal can reduce latency and save bandwidth. See rejection of claim 10 for further explanation.

Regarding claim 26, the combination of Gummalla and Sara teaches art of the limitations as discussed for claim 21 above, wherein Sara discloses that at least one of the downstream signals is a video signal (page 3, paragraph 43).

Regarding claim 33, the combination of Gummalla and Sara teaches art of the [imitations as discussed for claim 28, wherein Sara teaches that reducing the amount of header information associated with the transmitted signal can reduce latency and save bandwidth. See rejection of claim 10 for further explanation.

Regarding claim 34, the combination of Gummalla and Sara teaches all of the limitations as discussed for claim 28 above, wherein Sara discloses that at [east one of the downstream signals is a video signal (page 3, paragraph 43).

### ***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Manning whose telephone number is 571-272-7352. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JM

September 27, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John Miller', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**JOHN MILLER**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**